



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

an ever more efficient factor in all that pertains to the nation's mental and literary strength.

The institutions that we represent and in which we work, are, in name and mission, literary institutions, and is it too much to say, primarily, English literary institutions? and the hopefulness of the outlook lies in the fact that English educators the country over, see, as never before, the errors that have hindered them and the open way to better things; understand each other, as never before, in their respective relations to secondary and subsequent training; insist, as never before, that our students in training shall appreciate the English literary legacy that is theirs, and become, in their place and time, inspiring forces in American education and American life.

T. W. HUNT.

Princeton University.

GERMANIC GRAMMAR.

*The Verbum Perfectivum as a Substitute for the Future Tense.*¹

STREITBERG in his article *Perfective und imperfective Actionsart*, in PBB. xv, attempts to prove that Ulfilas made use of the existing difference between imperfective and perfective Actionsart² as a substitute for the missing future form. He says:

"Wir haben gesehen, dass die perfective Actionsart auch in den slavischen Sprachen zum Ersatz des fehlenden Futurums verwandt wird; wir haben auch gesehen, worin dieser Gebrauch begründet ist. Gebrauche ich nämlich die Präsensform eines momentan perfectiven Verbums, z. B. *ich komme*, so besteht eine zwifache Möglichkeit: einmal, Beginn und Vollendung der Handlung fällt in demselben Moment zusammen, in dem Augenblick der Aeusserung, oder zweitens, der Moment der Vollendung gehört erst der Zukunft an; *ich komme* heisst alsdann ich mache die Bewegung des Gehens und setze dieselbe fort bis zum Zeitpunkt der Vollendung, dem Eintreffen. Dieser Zeitpunkt der Vollendung, der dem perfectiven Verb eigen ist, liegt also nicht mehr in der Gegenwart, sondern tritt erst in der Zukunft ein. Dies ist namentlich

¹ The substance of this contribution is taken from the writer's dissertation: *Über die Wiedergabe des lateinischen Futurums bei den althochdeutschen Übersetzern des 8.-10. Jahrhunderts*. Göttingen, 1897.

² The writer prefers to leave this term untranslated.

bei durativ-perfectiven Verben der Fall: z. B. *ich besteige den Berg*, d. h. 'ich führe die Bewegung des Steigens in der Richtung nach dem Gipfel hin bis zu dem Augenblick fort, in dem dieser erreicht ist.' Das Anlangen am Ziel ist auch hier nur ein Moment und zwar ein der Zukunft angehöriger, aber er steht in ausdrücklichem Gegensatz zur vorausgehenden Dauer der Handlung.

Da also jede perfective Präsensform im gewöhnlichen Verlauf der Dinge einen Hinweis auf die Zukunft enthält, so eignet sie sich nicht übel zum Ersatz der fehlenden Futurform."³

After these preliminary remarks, the writer proceeds to show that Ulfilas both felt and made use of this future element in the present tense of perfective verbs for the purpose of expressing the future tense. He brings together a number of cases where Gothic perfective compound verbs translate Greek simple verbs in the future tense. For example Matt. 8, 7 *ik quimands gahailja*=*ῥεπαρεύσω*; Mc. 1, 17 *jah gatauja iggis wairþan nutans manne*=*ποιήσω*.

Can this use of perfectives as a substitute for the future tense be proved for Old High German?

Let us compare some of Streitberg's examples with the corresponding passages in Tatian.

1. Perfective Compounds.

Matt. 10, 29 *ains ize ni gadriusip* [*πείθειται*] *ana airpa*. Tat. 44, 20 translates this by means of the simplex: *ein fon then ni fellit* [*cadet*] *ubar erda*. *Gifel* occurs 102,1 which shows that the compound was in the translator's vocabulary.

Streitberg's favorite example for illustrating the difference between perfective and imperfective Actionsart is *saihwan*. On page 82 he says:

"*saihwan* heisst 'die Fähigkeit des Sehens besitzen, sie ausüben, im Sehen begriffen sein,' ist also ein rein duratives Verbum. Im Gegensatz hierzu bedeutet *gasaihwan* 'die Handlung des Sehens ausüben in Bezug auf den Moment der Vollendung, d. h. erblicken, bemerken.'"

The same distinction is also made between *hausjan*= 'die Fähigkeit des Hörens in Anwendung bringen' and *gahausjan*= 'vernehmen.'

³ See PBB. xv, 120.

⁴ Examples might be multiplied if space allowed.

Tatian 74, 6: *gihörnests gihóret ir inti ni furstantet, inti gisehente gisehet inti ni gisehet*=*auditu audietis et non intellegitis, et videntes videbitis et non videbitis*. According to Streitberg's theory this means: 'was ihr mit den Ohren vernehmen werdet, werdet ihr nicht verstehen.' So far it agrees with Streitberg's view, but let us go farther:

'ihr besitzet die Fähigkeit des Sehens (*gisehente*), und werdet diese Fähigkeit ausüben (*gisehet*), doch werdet ihr nicht zum Ziele des Sehens gelangen, d. h. nichts erblicken.'

Here the distinction is entirely lost sight of, the compound serving at once for the imperfective and the perfective idea. In the preceding verse the same verbs are involved: *bithiu sprihhu ih in in rátissán, uanta sehente ni gisehent inti gihórente ni gehórent noh ni furstantent*. Note *sehente* and *gihórente*.

88. 8 *thie tóten hórent* (*audient*) *stemma gotes sunes, inti thie sia gihórent* (*audierint*) *lebént*. Why *hórent* and *gi-hórent*? The Actionsart is the same in both cases. These examples prove beyond doubt that the translator of Tatian did not recognize any difference between *sehan* and *gisehan*, *hóren* and *gihóren*, and made use of the two words as chance dictated.

It is not the purpose of this investigation, however, to show how far Tatian distinguishes between perfective and imperfective verbs, that is, compound and simple forms like *sehan* and *gisehan*. The question here is, whether Perfective Compounds have been employed to supply the missing future. These examples are indisputable evidence that such is not the case.

2. *Werdan* and *uuesan*.

Streitberg shows that Ulfilas has used without exception the perfective *wairpan* for the Greek *ἐποιεῖν*, excepting, of course, the cases where the imperfective Actionsart is also necessary for the future tense. His words are: "Wie nämlich im slavischen das imperfectiv *byti* 'sein' und das perfectiv *bǫdǫ* 'werden' nebeneinanderbestehen und dieses die Futurfunction für jenes übernimmt, so übernimmt auch got. *wairpan* die Futurfunction für das imperf. *wisan*; während dies also regelmässig das griech. *ἐμὴν* überträgt, gibt jenes das griech. Futurum *ἐποιεῖν* wieder."

Do we also find this distinction in Tatian?

Streitberg's first example is Matt. 5, 21: *saei maurpreip skula wairpíp* [ἐῶραι] *stauai*. We find the same in Tatian 26, 1: *thie thår slehit, ther ist* [erit] *sculdig duomes*. Also Matt. 6, 22: *jabai nu angó þein ainfaþ ist, allatu leik þein liuhadein wairpíp* [ἐῶραι]=Tatian 36, 3: *oba thín ouga uuirðit lúttar, thanne ist* [erit] *al thín lthhamo liohtér*. Here we have the reverse of Streitberg's theory, *uuirðit* is plainly imperfective and *ist* perfective. Luke 6, 35: *jah wairpíp mizdo izwara managa, jah wairpíp sunjus hauhistins*=Tat. 32, 8 *inti ist* [erit] *inuvar mieta mihhilu inti ir birut* [eritis] *kind thes hóhisten*. 147, 4: *Zuá sint malenti in ein: ein ist ginoman inti ander uuirðit forlázzan. Zuei sint in einemo bette: ein ist ginoman inti ander ist forlázzan*. Here the use of *uuerdan* and *uuesan* is entirely arbitrary.

Examples might be multiplied indefinitely. Those given above suffice to prove that the translator of Tatian saw no distinction between *ist=erit* and *uuirðit=erit*.

Although we have decisive and ample evidence that Streitberg's theory does not apply to Tatian, it will not do to rest here and infer that it does not apply to Old High German as a whole, especially as it is evident on all hands that the translator, or translators, of Tatian possessed but an imperfect knowledge of their mother-tongue.

Compared with that of Tatian, the translation of Isidor possesses some literary merit of its own, showing that it must have been the work of a man who not only knew his Latin well, but was also well grounded in his native language. In his work we should expect to find those nice distinctions which the translator of Tatian may have overlooked.

We find sufficient material for our investigation. A fine example occurs in 37, 15, *der selbo zimbrit mir hús, endi ih chifestinón dhes . . . untazs in euun=ipse edificavit mihi domum, et firmabo*. Why *zimbrit* and *chifestinón*? Gothic *timrjan* is one of Streitberg's examples.⁵ Cf. Ulfilas Mc. 14, 58, *bi þrins dagans anpara* [alþ] *unhanduwaurhta gat-imrja*. Is. 36, 18, *dhínera uuomba waxsmín setzu* [ponam] *ih ubar miin hóhsetli*. According to Streitberg, we should have here *chisetzu*, for *ubar miin hóhsetli* indicates the goal of the

⁵ PBB, xv, 128.

action ('Ziel der Handlung'). 39, 8, *endi uutsi uuiridit [erit] endi frummit [faciet] urdeili*. Here we can assume a perfective or imperfective meaning according to our point of view. According to Streitberg's theory, however, the two verbs *uuiridit*=perfective and *frummit*=imperfective ought to agree in their Actionsart.

Werdan and *uuesan*.⁶ Isidor translates the Latin *ero, erit, erunt*:

a. by *uerdan*. Cf. 11, 1, *endi sie uuerdant zi scaahche=erunt pæda*; 22, 14, *sinera sipbea ni uuiridit [erit] endi*; 39, 8, *endi uutsi uuiridit [erit]*.

b. by *scal uuesan*. 17, 12, *miin gheist scal uuesan [erit]*; 37, 17, *ih scal imu uuesan [ero] in fater stedi endi (ir) scal mir uuesan [erit] in sunes*.⁷

c. by *scal siin*. There is one example in 42, 21: *siin grab scal siin guotliih*.

d. by *ist*. 34, 17, *dher selbo ist dhes dheodun bidant*. This sentence can be explained in a twofold manner. It is possible to read into it a durative idea; namely, 'he will always be, that is, remain the one whom they were looking for'; they will never be disappointed in him. This explanation is forced. The meaning is evidently perfective; namely, when he comes they will see that he is the expected one.

These examples are sufficient to prove that the translator of Isidor, as well as the one of Tatian, did not feel the difference between perfective and imperfective Actionsart. If this distinction had really existed, he would certainly have made use of it, for he gives ample evidence that he both understood and valued his native tongue.

Among the larger O.H.G. translations only the Monsee Fragments remain to be considered.

Following our order, we will first examine the compounds. We have at once a fine opportunity to test Streitberg's favorite examples, *sehan* and *hören*.⁸ Only the compounds *gasehan* and *gahörren* occur in the Fragments, these verbs without the prefix not appearing in a single instance. Compare 8, 24, with Tatian 74, 5. The passage in the Fragments

is mutilated, but the words in question have survived: namely, *gahörrente ni gahörrent=audientes non audiunt neque intellegunt*. The idea in *gahörrente* is purely durative and indicates in the language of Streitberg: "die Fähigkeit des Hörens in Anwendung bringen." Why *gahörrente*? In the same connection we read *gasehhante gasihit=videntes videbitis et non videbitis*. According to Streitberg this must mean: "you possess the power of seeing and will exercise this power" (ihr besitzt die Fähigkeit des Sehens und werdet diese Fähigkeit ausüben). Both ideas are plainly durative. 5, 7, *seczu [ponam] ih mnan gheist ubar inan*. See Tat. 69, 9, where also the simplex *sezzu* is employed: also Tat. 130, 2, where the compound occurs; namely, *ih gisezzu [ponam] thine stianta untar scamal thintero fuozo*. Isidor also 36, 18, has *setzu=ponam*.

19, 1, *samnót sih arun=congregabuntur aquilæ*. In the same chapter, nine lines farther, we find *kasamnót [congregabunt] sine kachorane*. These examples suffice to show that the translator took no notice of the future element in compounds with *ga*.

The future of *esse* has, as in the case of Isidor, three translations:

a. *werdan*. 10, 3, *so selb uuiridit [erit] in enti uueralti*; 13, 3, *so uuerdant sie=erunt*; 14, 3, *der . . . uuiridit [erit] iuuer scalh*, etc.

b. *scal*. There are five examples of this construction; 10, 6, *dar im scal [erit] uuesan uuoft enti zano gagrinn*; 13, 29, *scal so uuesan [erit] untar in*, etc.

c. *wesan*. 4, 23, *huuelih iuuer ist der man der ein scaf habet*, etc. Here the original Latin text is wanting. The codex Amiatinus⁹ reads: *quis erit ex vobis homo*. The idea is manifestly imperfective and signifies: "who of you is such a man"? Nevertheless, this is no conclusive evidence that the translator wished to distinguish between perfectivity and imperfectivity. His codex may have read *est* in place of *erit*.

26, 19 (incomplete). *sprihhu ih bim imo danne elidiutic . . . sprihhit mir ist elidiutic [si ergo nesciero virtutem vocis, ero ei cui loquor barbarus, et is qui loquitur barbarus]*.

⁹ This codex is very similar to the one used by the translator of the Fragments.

⁶ PBB. xv, 132.

⁷ In all there are seven instances of this use of *scal*.

⁸ PBB. xv, 82.

This evidently means: "when I begin to speak to him, in that moment I become to him *barbarus*." The translator has chosen *bim danne* to express this perfective idea.

The frequent use of *scal uuesan* indicates that the translator was not entirely satisfied with *uuerdan* as an exact equivalent for *erit*.

In the light of these examples, we are also obliged to reject Streitberg's theory for the Monsee Fragments.

The Benedictine Rule, the Murbach Hymns and the smaller monuments show also no traces of a distinction between perfective and imperfective Actionsart with reference to the future tense.

As the result of these investigations, we are forced to the general conclusion that Streitberg's theory, which he hopes to see verified for all the Germanic dialects, does not hold good for O.H.G. Wustmann in his monograph, *Verba Perfectiva, namentlich in Heliland*, shows that it must also be rejected for Old Saxon. He even refuses to accept it for Gothic in spite of Streitberg's ingenious exposition.

ELLEN C. HINSDALE.

Mount Holyoke College, Mass.

AMERICAN-FRENCH DIALECT COMPARISON.

Two Acadian-French Dialects compared with "Some Specimens of a Canadian-French Dialect Spoken in Maine."

PAPER NO. II.* (Conclusion.)

TABLE NO. I.

PHONOLOGICAL table of speech varieties known to occur with regularity in one or more of the French-speaking regions in and about the Dominion of Canada, illustrating *regularly-recurring variations* from standard French, with the French equivalents.

â=Fr. *â* or *a* in *pas*; a⁴⁹=Fr. *a* in *pas*; â=Fr. *a* in *pâtte*; æ as in E. *hat*; é=Fr. *è* and *ê*; è=Fr. *è* (in Fr. *ais* endings, etc. Acadian regions); e=Fr. *e* in *de*; æ=Fr. *è* (Canadian re-

gions); i=Fr. *i*; ĩ⁵⁰=Fr. *i*; ô⁵¹=Fr. *ô* or *a*; ô=Fr. *o* in *pot*; ô=Fr. *o* in *fort*; ô=Fr. *eu* in *peu*; ô⁵²=Fr. *eu* in *peur*; ô=Fr. *u* in E. *but*; u=Fr. *o* before *m* or *n* not nasal (Acadian regions); ũ=Fr. *u* in E. *pull*; ü=Fr. *ü*; wa=Fr. *oi* final (Acadian regions); wé=Fr. *oi* final (Canadian regions); wè=Fr. *oi* not final; wé=Fr. *oi* not final; æ=Fr. *un*; æ=Fr. *in*; æ=Fr. *en*; æ⁵³=Fr. *on*; â=Fr. *en, an*; â⁵⁴=Fr. *in*; è=nasal of Fr. *è*.

For this purpose, the French consonants may most conveniently be divided into: 1. Stops; 2. Liquids; and 3. Continuants.

1. Of the French stops, *p* and *b* correspond with dialect *p* and *b* very generally in all positions. Although cases of the assimilation of voiced consonants to unvoiced and the like (for example, dialect *apsæ*=Fr. *absent*), occur with great *regularity* in these dialects, inasmuch as they characterize to a greater or less extent all natural speech, they do not appear to me typical dialect features in the sense the table contemplates such traits. Likewise French *t, d, k* and *g*, when not before front vowels, correspond with dialect *t, d, k* and *g*. When, however, in French either *t, d, k* or *g* is followed by a front vowel the dialect equivalents may vary from the French. Thus dialect *ky*=Fr. *k* before front vowels: [kyèl]=Fr. *quel*; kyör=Fr. *cœur* (Canadian regions). Dialect tš=Fr. *k* before front vowels: [tšèl]=Fr. *quel*; tšör=Fr. *cœur* (Acadian regions). Dialect tš=Fr. *t*+front vowel final, or before a consonant: [ptši]=Fr. *petit*; kriätšür=Fr. *créature* (Canadian regions). But dialect t=Fr. *t* before *i* or *u* final or before a consonant: [pti]=Fr. *petit*; kriätür=Fr. *créature* (Acadian regions). Dialect tš=Fr. *t*+vowel (usually *i*) followed by another vowel: [mètšé]=Fr. *métier*; mōtšé=Fr. *moitié* (Acadian regions). Dialect

¹⁵⁰ Cf. Professor Chamberlain's article on the dialect of Granby in MOD. LANG. NOTES, for Jan., 1893, and the observations on *i*, p. 33 of his notes.

¹⁵¹ See Professor Squair's List (3) and cf. Professor Chamberlain's notes to Granby dialect, Nos. 1, 3 and 5, p. 31.

¹⁵² Rare, as far as I have observed.

¹⁵³ Can be heard in terminations corresponding to Fr. *-tion* in and around Bonaventure, Baie des Chaleurs.

¹⁵⁴ Noted in a number of words at Bonaventure; pā=Fr. *pain*; mā=Fr. *main*, etc. For similar and identical treatment of the Fr. nasals Corblet's Picard dictionary furnishes illustrations.

* Paper No. I appeared in MOD. LANG. NOTES for December, 1893, January and February, 1894; and part of Paper No. II in December, 1897, January, February and April, 1898.

¹⁴⁹ See the observations on *â, æ* and *ä* at the beginning of Professor Sheldon's paper. I have not been able personally to observe a dialect *a*=Fr. *a* in *pas*, occurring regularly.